<u>REMARKS</u>

By this Amendment, claims 1, 13, 25 and 31 have been amended to merely clarify the recited subject matter. Claims 1-23, 25 and 27-31 are pending.

Applicants submit that the amended claims are sufficiently clear under the 35 U.S.C. 112 standard because the claims read in light of the specification clearly indicate that any kind of data which causes a modification of the subscriber database contents can be transmitted from the terminal.

Claims 1-11, 14-22, 25 and 27-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Leung et al. (U.S. 6,466,964; hereafter "Leung") and claims 12 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leung and Oh (U.S. 6,519,458). Applicants traverse the rejections because the cited prior art fails to disclose, teach or suggest all the features recited in the rejected claims. For example, the cited prior art fails to disclose, teach or suggest the claimed invention wherein there is communication between the terminal and the subscriber database by Internet Protocol (IP) based data transmission, the terminal transmits subscriber data to the subscriber database to modify the subscriber database contents and including automatic transmission, from the subscriber database, of subscriber data relating to the subscriber database.

Leung merely teaches on the subject of Mobile IP and discloses a method for providing IP mobility for a node that does not support Mobile IP. The basic principle of this system is described in Leung at col. 3, lines 4-20, wherein Leung teaches that a foreign agent independently registers a node not supporting Mobile IP with a Home agent. A "virtual" foreign agent is then established in the system to provide the illusion of a single gateway being used for the node.

The Office Action submitted that the claimed creation of a database comprising subscriber data is anticipated by Leung's disclosure of a security association table (see, Leung, beginning of column 8). However, <u>Leung's security association table does not anticipate the claimed subscriber data database, which includes subscriber data and functionally connected to a bearer network providing a terminal with services.</u>

Further, contrary to the assertions of the Office Action, Leung fails to disclose, teach or suggest establishment of a connection between a serving network and the terminal by the subscriber application included in the terminal. The Office Action asserted that col. 7, line 62 – col. 8, line 16 and Figure 5 allegedly teach this feature; however, this description merely relates to the generation of a registration request by a mobile IP foreign agent and

transmission of the registration request to a home agent; thus, Leung merely teaches communication between network elements. Further, Leung fails to teach or suggest utilization of a subscriber application included in a terminal, e.g., a GSM SIM module in an IC card, to establish the connection between the serving network and the terminal.

Moreover, Leung fails to disclose, teach or suggest the claimed arrangement of communication between the terminal and the subscriber database by IP based data. Contrary to the assertions of the Office Action, Leung fails to teach or suggest communication between a terminal and a subscriber database; rather, the AAA server and the security association table are contacted by the foreign agent, i.e., a network element, to establish a registration request (see column 8, lines 4-8 and column 4, lines 39-42).

Further, Leung fails to teach or suggest the claimed automated checking of a right of a terminal to use a subscriber database. The Office Action asserted that Leung's Figure 9 and its associated description define steps performed by the home agent and the foreign agent. It is determined if the registration by the foreign agent is authenticated by the home agent, for instance by using an authentication key shared by the home agent and the foreign agent. Thus, this authentication procedure is not for checking the right of the terminal to use a subscriber database (particularly since the subscriber database was considered to be equivalent with the security association table in an AAA server).

Accordingly, col. 15, line 45 – column 16, line 15 of Leung, and Leung in general, does not anticipate the claimed terminal related feature combination of transmitting subscriber data automatically from the subscriber database to the terminal, providing the terminal with services according to said transmitted data, or transmitting subscriber data from the terminal to the subscriber database to modify the subscriber database contents, as currently claimed in the independent claims.

Further, Oh fails to remedy the deficiencies of Leung because Oh merely teaches generally on the subject of a WAP system. Therefore, the combined teachings of the cited prior art would still have failed to provide the combination of all features recited in the rejected independent claims.

Accordingly, claims 1-23, 25 and 27-31 are patentable over the cited prior and allowable and Applicants request issuance of a notice to that effect. However, if anything further is necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, Applicants request that the Examiner telephone the undersigned Applicants representative.

Please charge any fees associated with the submission of this paper to Deposit Account Number 033975. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any over payments to the above-referenced Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP

CHRISTINE H. MCCARTHY
Reg. No. 41844
Tel. No.   703 770.7743
Fax No.   703 770.7901

Date: August 25, 2006
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, VA 22102
(703) 770-7900